

## **REMARKS**

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action dated June 7, 2004. As this paper is filed on December 7, 2004 with a three-month extension of time, the paper is timely filed.

### **I. Status of Amendments**

Claims 1-57 were pending prior to this response. Claims 1-3 and 32-34 have been amended, and claims 12-31 and 47-57 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-11 and 32-46 are now pending.

### **II. Response to the June 7 Office Action**

An unidentified claim was objected to for redundancy. Based on the citation made, the reference appears to be to claim 1, but applicants respectfully request that the examiner recite the claim or claims objected to and specifically state how the claims are objectionable so that applicants may more appropriately address the examiner's concerns, if applicants' amendments have not already resolved the objections.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 22-25, 29-35, 39-50, and 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Bell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,505,461) in view of Kahn et al. (WIPO Publ. No. 01/25992)<sup>1</sup>. Claims 5-7, 12-21, 26-28, 36-38, and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Bell et al. in view of Kahn et al. further in view of the Holt and Kiplinger references.

At the outset, claims 12-31 and 47-57 have been cancelled, thus mooted the rejections in this regard. As to claims 1-11 and 32-46, applicants have the following comments regarding claims 1 and 32, as amended.

Claim 1 recites a payout administration method including verifying the location of a gaming apparatus adapted to receive a wager from a player and to provide a payout base on the wager and a game outcome, the gaming apparatus being disposed at a location outside a

---

<sup>1</sup> Kahn et al. was misidentified in the June 7 Office Action as WIPO Publ. No. 01/08070.

gaming system operator's property. The method also includes retrieving an electronic form selected according to a location of a gaming apparatus adapted to receive a wager from a player and to provide a payout based on the wager and a game outcome the gaming apparatus. The method further includes retrieving stored data about the gaming apparatus or the player, verifying that the stored data is sufficient to complete the electronic form, and combining the electronic form and the stored data to generate a completed electronic form.

Bell et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the recited subject matter of claim 1, as is admitted by the introduction of Kahn et al. to form the rejection of the June 7 Office Action. Applicants submit that claim 1, as further amended to recite that the location of the gaming apparatus, which is disposed outside a gaming system operator's property, must be verified, further distinguishes Bell et al. In particular, Bell et al. consistently presents a system wherein the gaming machines are on the premises of the gaming system operator. There is nothing to suggest that the gaming machines of Bell et al. are located anywhere other than on the premises of the gaming system operator. Consequently, Bell et al. does not disclose, nor does it teach or suggest, anything in regard to verifying the location of the gaming apparatuses, for such a proposition is contrary to its presentation in its entirety.

Kahn et al. also does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the recited subject matter of claim 1, as is admitted by its combination with Bell et al. to form the rejection of the June 7 Office Action. Applicants submit that claim 1, as further amended to recite that the location of the gaming apparatus must be verified, further distinguishes Kahn et al. or the combination of Kahn et al. and Bell et al., even if that combination is assumed to be appropriate. In particular, Kahn et al. discusses a system to be used by employers and their employees. The location of the employees, which apparently allegedly correspond to the gaming apparatuses of the claimed subject matter, is never presented as an unknown to their employers. In fact, the location (e.g., address) is presented as a known item of employee data (page 14, line 31) input by the employer (page 15, lines 5-7). As such, the alleged combination does not disclose each and every limitation of the claimed subject matter.

Similarly, claim 32 recites payout administration system including a gaming apparatus comprising a display apparatus that is capable of generating video images, a value

input device, and a controller operatively coupled to said display apparatus and said value input device, said controller comprising a processor and a memory operatively coupled to said processor. The controller is programmed to allow a person to make a wager, to cause a video image to be generated on said display apparatus, said video image representing a game, and to determine, after said video image has been displayed, a value payout associated with an outcome of said game represented by said video image. The system also includes a computer comprising a processor and a memory operatively coupled to said processor. The computer is programmed to verify a location of the gaming apparatus, the gaming apparatus being disposed at a location outside a gaming system operator's property, to retrieve an electronic form selected according to the location of the gaming apparatus, to retrieve stored data about at least one of the player and the gaming apparatus, and to combine the electronic form and the stored data to generate a completed electronic form.

Because claim 32, like claim 1, recites that the computer is programmed to verify a location of the gaming apparatus, the gaming apparatus being disposed at a location outside a gaming system operator's property, and to retrieve an electronic form selected according to the location of the gaming apparatus, applicants submit that neither Bell et al. nor Kahn et al., either taken individually or in combination, anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claim 32. In particular, applicants submit that, in keeping with the arguments raised above, Bell et al. and Kahn et al. disclose, teach and suggest nothing in regard to determination of a location of a gaming apparatus disposed at a location outside a gaming system operator's property. Consequently, applicants submit that claim 32, like claim 1, is allowable.

As for claims 2-11, which depend from claim 1, and claims 33-46, which depend from claim 32, because claims 1 and 32 are patentable over Bell et al. and Kahn et al., whether taken individually or in combination, these claims would also be allowable.

Serial No. 10/085,779  
Reply dated December 7, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2004


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above application is in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. If there is any matter that the Examiner would like to discuss, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

Date: December 7, 2004

By:



Paul C. Craane  
Registration No. 38,851  
6300 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300